

# Christian Intelligencer.

Vol. XV.

Gardiner, Maine, Friday, January 15, 1836.

New Series, Vol. IX—No. 52

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING FOR  
THE PROPRIETOR,  
BY JOHN RAMSEY.

N. CLEVELAND FLETCHER, Editor.

## A SERMON.

BY SEBASTIAN STREETER.

But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference. ROMANS 4: 21, 22

The text affords four topics of discourse.

1. The righteousness of God, and its manifestation without the law.

11. The way in which this righteousness is witnessed by the law and the prophets.

111. How it is unto all, and upon all them that believe.

IV The meaning of the phrase—there is no difference.

What then, is meant by the righteousness of God? On this question the logical writers abound in speculation, in curious and refined definitions. Upon these, however, I shall not dwell. They generally perplex, instead of enlightening and instructing the mind.—Cruden says, Righteousness signifies, that perfection of the divine nature, whereby God is most just, and most holy in himself, and in all his dealings with his creatures, and observes the strictest rules equity. 2. The clemency, mercy, and goodness of God. 3. His truth and faithfulness in fulfilling and making good his promises.

Now these definitions are substantially correct, but still, they have too much amplification to make a distinct and lasting impression upon common minds.—They are not sufficient concise and simple for practical purpose. I have just repeated these definitions, and I have done it audibly and distinctly, but it is questionable whether one of my hearers has derived from them a distinct and clear idea of the Divine righteousness. This failure, however, is not attributable to a dulness of apprehension in my congregation; but to the number of the definitions, and the verbose manner in which they are stated. The only way in which we can obtain a precise knowledge of this subject, is by the precise meaning of the term righteousness. As a moral principle, this is the same in all ages, and worlds, and beings. When applied to God, it has not, as an abstract principle, and with respect to its nature, anything mysterious or peculiar in it, and I am not certain that in this view, it has any thing supernatural in it.

Righteousness, in an angel, or a man, is as really righteousness, as though it were found in God himself. If there be any possible difference, and there unquestionably is, it consists in degree and in the constancy of its operations, and not in its abstract nature.

Let us descend then, to our own world, and examine this subject as it is found in our own race. What is righteousness in man? I answer, it is a principle which inclines him to feel right and to do right. The heart which is right towards God, and towards man. This then is the plain and the true meaning of righteousness. It is right. It inclines a man to feel right. He who fails in these moral duties is not a righteous man, but he who does them, works righteousness, and is in the language of scripture, and in strict propriety of speech a righteous man. Righteousness then, is simply, a principle of equity which inclines an intelligent, social being to do what is right and to avoid what is wrong; to be true, not false; honest, not fraudulent; kind, not cruel; faithful, not faithless. In the language of inspiration, to render to all their due, tribute to whom tribute, custom to whom custom, and honour to whom honour is due. In a more condensed form, it is to 'render to God the things that are God's and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's.' The golden rule of the Saviour is a little different in phrasing, but not in sense. 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.'

This definition gives a precise, and if I may so speak, a tangible meaning to the phrase—righteousness of God. It is an essential property of the Divine nature, one which inclines him, and forever will incline him, to do perfectly right with respect to every system and world, and in every period of their whole existence. Influenced by this principle, there will occur in the whole circle and variety of his dealings, nothing wrong or unkind, evil or injurious.

As the lawgiver and judge of the whole earth, and of the universe, it will incline him to do right. As the Father of intelligent being, it will forever incline him to be good to all, and to ex-

ercise his tender mercies over all his works. As the possessor and friend of perfect holiness, it will incline him to make an end of all sin. As a God of order and not of confusion, it will incline him to reconcile all things to himself. And, as the source of life and blessedness, it will incline him to 'swallow up death in victory and wipe away tears from off all faces.'

These things will not be done in a moment. They are stupendous events. They are to be effected by the use of means; and, to be done in a judicious and orderly way, they require an appropriate period of time. But God has proposed these things, and his counsel will stand. He has promised them, and he will bring them to pass. 'The word has gone out of his mouth in righteousness, and will not return to him void; it will accomplish his pleasure, and prosper in the thing whereto he has sent.'—'In the dispensation of the fulness of times,' he will, assuredly, gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him. All these things, his own righteousness, which includes his mercy, and grace, and truth, will prompt him to accomplish; and who in view of them can avoid the exulting exclamation; 'Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. His dominion ruleth over all.' 'He is God over all blessed' and blessing 'forevermore.'

Now what is that makes one thing righteous and another unrighteous, one thing good and another evil, is a distinct question. It is not necessarily involved the fact of their existence. We may understand the one, and remain ignorant of the other. It is an abstract question upon which there has never been any thing like uniformity of opinion. There is still a wide difference of opinion among theologians and moralists with respect to the source whence moral principles derive their nature and their obligations; and the criterion by which the genuine may be distinguished from the spurious. That there are spurious religions and moral principles in circulation, there can be no more doubt than that there is counterfeit coin. All the trumpery and conflicting vagaries which pass in the community for religion cannot be pure and vital godliness. The thing is impossible. Opposite emotions and actions cannot be of the same nature and tendency. This is self evident.

But the question is, what makes one exercise of the heart and action of the life pure, and another impure? In other words, and to give the question a more general form; what makes one action right and another wrong; one true and another false; one good and another evil? To this question different answers are given. Some contend that right and wrong, good and evil, truth and falsehood exist in the nature and fitness of things, and, therefore, can be distinguished by a recurrence to these sources of information, a candid and patient examination of the nature and fitness of things. Others, strenuously maintain that the will of God, without reference to the nature and fitness of things, is the proper standard, and the only true standard of right and wrong, good and evil.—They suppose an action, or a principle is right and good because God wills and commands it, and another action, or principle wrong and evil because he wills it not and forbids it.

Now that an action which God commands, or a principle which he approves, is good, must be admitted on all hands; and that an action which he forbids, or a principle which he condemns, must be evil is equally certain. But still, we shall probably find it extremely difficult to perceive how the mere will of any being, arbitrarily exercised, can impart to an action, or a principle, its essential qualities. We are acquainted with no process by which will, of itself, can produce essential properties. So far as our researches extend, we discover no such power in mere will. It can give direction and inclination to properties; but so far as we can perceive, it cannot produce them. And is not the will itself voluntary exercise of principles which are previously resident in a rational being? How then, can will produce the qualities of principles, the existence of which was antecedent to, or at least co-eval with its own?

The righteous man wills to do justly, to deal uprightly in his intercourse with the world, and he does it because he is actuated by the principles of righteousness. His will is a result of his principles in a state of activity.

The unrighteous man wills to do unjustly, to deal dishonestly, and he does it, because he is actuated by the principles of unrighteousness. His will is the result of his principles in a state of activity.

The intemperate man wills to indulge his appetite for strong drink, and he does it, because he is actuated by the principles of intemperance. His will also is the result of his principles, and his

will for excessive drinking will cease.

So the thief wills to obtain his neighbour's property by unlawful means, and he purloins it, because he is actuated by the principles of theft. His will is a result of his principles. Remove his disposition to theft, and his will to pursue his unlawful course will cease.

In the cases here enumerated, and for aught that appears, in all others, the actions are a result of the will, and the will itself a result of principles previously existing in the agents, and which are aroused to a state of activity by circumstances. So if I mistake not, the will of God is a natural and necessary result of the undivided purity and perfection of his nature. God is a holy Being, and of course, he is opposed to all sin, and sincerely wills the holiness of all his intelligent creation. He is the fountain of truth, and, therefore, opposed to all falsehood, and will that we 'speak the truth every man to his neighbour.' He is 'slow to anger and of great mercy,' and of course, he is opposed to all wrath and cruelty, and wills that we be 'kind, and courteous, and pitiful.' God is perfectly and uniformly righteous, and therefore, he is, in his nature, opposed to all that is wrong and injurious, and wills righteousness as the final portion of all rational beings. It is on this ground that the scriptures declare that 'all shall be taught of God,' and that 'his people shall all be righteous.' It is on this ground also that he sent his son Jesus into the world to turn sinners, 'every one of them, from their iniquities,' and 'to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.' Where the Deity unrighteous, he would neither will, nor promise, nor perform these things.

The righteousness of God as a principle, it should be remarked, is not a derived, but an undivided property. It was inherent, from eternity, in the nature of Jehovah, and will remain so through interminable ages. It needs no increase, and it is incapable of diminution. But this eternal and unchangeable perfection of God, is manifested to the understandings of men by degrees. They gain the knowledge of it progressively. According to the text, it was manifested more clearly and truly by the gospel of Christ, than in the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law. It was exhibited through types and shadows even in this, but appeared in its glory and perfection in the grace and truth which filled the Redeemer and his doctrine. But in this superior and even plenary manifestation, it was witnessed by the law and the prophets; their rites and predictions showed it to be the same righteousness of God which had been imperfectly beheld in preceding dispensations.

11. Let us now consider the way in which the righteousness of God, in the gospel, without the ceremonies of the law, was witnessed by the law and the prophets. 1. One leading point in the gospel, is, that Jesus 'died for the offences of sinners and arose again for their justification.' He offered himself once for all, that 'he might put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' In this offering and sacrifice 'he was made to us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption.' In these also, he fulfilled the righteousness of God.—Now the law bore witness to the genuineness of this righteousness, because the law required the shedding of blood for the remission of sins. It typically put away sin by 'the offering of sacrifices year by year continually.' Thus the typical sacrifices of the law, even after it ceased as a dispensation, bore witness to the great sacrifice of Christ, who 'gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time.' 2. Jesus enjoined upon his followers a pure and spiritual worship. 'The hour cometh says he, and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him. The law morally considered required such worship. 'Ye shall worship the Lord your God,' says Moses, 'and him only shall thou serve.'—Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.' Hence, the law witness to the piety of the gospel. 3. The author and finisher of the christian faith enjoined in the most peremptory manner the practice of every moral, social and personal virtue. He commanded his followers to abstain from all evil, and even from 'the appearance of evil;' to be 'perfect in every good word and work;' not to kill, nor lie, nor steal; nor even to covet, in their hearts, any thing which belonged to another. He enjoined upon masters, kindness to their servants, and upon servants, to be obedient to their own masters; upon children, to honor their parents, and upon parents, to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, to habits of piety, industry and virtue. Now the law and the prophets enjoined the same things.—Hence, they gave witness to the morality, and to the social, domestic, and personal virtues inculcated by the gospel.

111. I pass to the consideration of my

third topic, viz. How the righteousness of God, without the law, is 'unto all, and upon all them that believe.' The believer in Christ holds habitual communion with his Master. By such intercourse, he gradually imbibes his spirit. 'The mind that was in Christ' becomes, at length, his own. In his family, and his daily commerce with the world, he seeks to be 'holy, and harmless, and undefiled,' as far as the present state will permit. He practically, as well as professedly, 'puts on the Lord Jesus Christ.' He intentionally does no evil, and suffers no guile to be in his heart. To live 'a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness, and honesty,' he considers not only the greatest ornament, but the duty and comfort of his existence.

The righteousness of God, as manifested in the doctrine and life of his blessed Master, is constantly in his mind and heart, and exerts a controlling influence over the whole tenor of his feelings conversation and conduct. How can he be false, while his Maker is so true, or cruel, while he is so kind? How can he be evil, while his God is so good, or illiberal and violent, while he is so bountiful and gentle? And can he, intentionally, live in folly and sin, while such splendours of wisdom and holiness are beaming upon his path way? No, he cannot. He does not. The prevailing desire of his soul is, to be 'holy as his Father in heaven is holy.' This is the dress in which he would appear at home and abroad; in public and private; in the house of God, and in the business of life. Unlike the pharisee and the dissembler, he does not appear gloomy and sad on the sabbath, and conduct rudely and unlawfully through the week. He has not one dress for his religious services, and another for his secular pursuits. He is always seen in the same attire, the 'robe of righteousness.'—This suffices him for every day in the week, and for every place, and company, and transaction.

I have only to add, he is not lavish of philanthropy to the poor and perishing afar off, and pitiless to the perishing widow and fatherless who are near him.—O no; like his Master, his heart melts with pity, and his eye waters with a tear over every object of want and woe; and his ready hand is reached out to relieve. His language is, 'They need not depart empty, I will give them to eat. But,

IV. I shall offer a remark or two on the meaning of the phrase, there is no difference, and close. By this expression we are not to understand that there is no disparity in human character, no moral difference among mankind; that the condition of an unbeliever is as good and commendable as that of a believer of the truth as it is in Jesus; or that the conduct of the immoral and dissolute is viewed by the eye of Heaven with the same complacency as that of the habitually upright and virtuous. No, God forbid! This is not the meaning of the holy apostle. It is not true. There is a wide difference in the conditions of a practical believer and unbeliever in the gospel. The one enjoys salvation from sin and the dominion of tormenting fears, the other is the victim of both; he is, in the plain language of the scriptures, 'under condemnation.' The one finds rest to his soul, the other, 'a fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation,' if not from his Maker, from the violated laws of his country and the convictions of his own conscience. The one is the child of peace, the other, of 'wrath, tribulation and anguish.' The difference therefore in their conditions is vast and truly appalling. Let no one have the folly and temerity to rush heedlessly into the latter, while the former is open and easy of access. But the meaning of the phrase, is, that the gospel made no difference between Jewish and Gentile converts to christianity. It was a dispensation of free, impartial grace to 'every nation, and kindred and tongue, and people under the whole heavens. The Mosaic law made a difference between the Jews and other nations, the gospel makes none. It demolished the middle walls of partition between and took it out of the way. It extended to both the same privileges, promises, hopes and comforts. In the spirit of a pure impartiality it announced that God was no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feared him and worked righteousness was accepted with him. There was no difference.—All were alike the objects of the Divine care, condescension and mercy and the sincere homage of their hearts equally acceptable to him.

So it is in the present day. The christian world is divided and subdivided into numberless sects and parties; but they are all equally the objects of God's protection and favour. He views them all and treats them all as his children. The members of each denomination in christianity may be ardent and obedient disciples of Christ, and the religious services of each equally acceptable to him. In their Master's eye there is no differ-

ence. The sincere homage of every sect is a 'sacrifice well-pleasing in his sight.' He will smile upon and bless every one who in sincerity loves his name and his service. O that christians of every name might learn to imitate their Master. Let them resolve to do this speedily. Let them no longer make a difference where he makes none. Let them abandon, fully and forever, their uncharitable bickerings and contentions. Let them cherish in their intercourse with each other 'the mind that was in Christ,' and earnestly strive to 'keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.'

THE DEVIL NOT A UNIVERSALIST.

Col. Stone, the editor of the New York Commercial Advertiser, has recently published an article, concerning a forth-coming biography of Lemuel Haynes, a negro preacher of Calvinism in the State of Vermont. The Col. seems to have a powerful sympathy with the diseased preacher's family, the exact cause of which we have not been able to ascertain, as we have never seen his face to our knowledge. The Col. intimates very broadly, that the Devil was the first Universalist. He is not content with exalting Lemuel Haynes by his lavished commendations; he must needs also say a few words in honor of another dusky preacher of falsehood, and so forth, who represents the Devil as being a Universalist. Now, we disown the whole trio—Lemuel Haynes, Col. Stone and the Devil; neither of them is a Universalist; and they need not endeavour to thrust one another into good company.

The Devil a believer of Universalism! Astonishing falsehood! There is no doctrine he hates like this; and all his children hate it as greatly as he does. Is he willing to have sinners saved? Does he believe in the love of God? Does he believe in the testimony of divine revelation? Does he believe that every knee shall bow, not to him, but to Christ, and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father?

Does the Devil believe that all sin shall be destroyed? that every deceived, beguiled, unhappy sinner shall be brought home? Does he believe that for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, viz. 'that he might destroy the works of the devil?' This is Universalism. Does the Devil believe it? If so, he believes the truth; he believes what the holy apostle John believed, and what hath the sanction of Jehovah in his word. Does the devil believe the declaration of Paul, as follows: 'that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is THE DEVIL; and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their life time subject to bondage?' This is Universalism. Neither the Devil, nor Lemuel Haynes nor Col. Stone ever believed this doctrine; and the Col. knows it.

We have one word to say in regard to the praise which has been bestowed on Lemuel Haynes, for his supposed originality in devising this objection to Universalism, that it was first preached by the devil in the garden of Eden. The objection was not original with Haynes. It was heard of long before Haynes preached it, in his sermon. It has for many years been a favorite objection with the opponents of Universal grace; and was urged in England long time ago. It is however, false; and we care very little whether the authorship is fixed upon Lemuel Haynes, the devil, or Col. Stone.—Trumpet.

DUTY OF PARENTS.

It is the duty of Parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—to nourish and cherish them—to provide both for their physical and mental wants. No parent is justified in provoking his children to wrath, for this will discourage them. A parent should always do for his children every thing in his power, to make them contented and happy. He who neglects to observe these things is very far from the path of his duty.

Some parents will sooner assist a stranger, than a child—they will treat their own offspring with a marked neglect, bordering upon stoical indifference, and upon others, freely lavish their bounty. This will beget within the bosom of a child, feelings of revenge and indignation. And how can it be otherwise? Parents should never indulge a partial fondness towards



their children. It frequently happens that children born of a second wife are the objects of the father's peculiar regard; that upon them he bestows his favour, in an extravagant degree, gratifying all their caprices, and leaving his former children to reflect upon their outcast and lonely condition, and all the gloomy reflections peculiar to such a situation. This course of conduct is peculiar to a father. Mothers are more stable in their affections. Their love is unchangeable—their attentions unflinching.

Every parent who prizes his own happiness, and the prosperity and well being of his children, should exercise an impartial affection towards them, and assist them in every possible way. Then will they esteem him, and cherish his memory with grateful recollection.

#### N INTELLIGENCER.

(See her radiance from the Press.)

FR, JANUARY 15, 1836.

#### GOD IS LOVE.

Not a more imposing truth presents itself in the scriptures of divine truth than that God is love, but how often is he misrepresented and robbed of his darling attribute and presented as a Being who delighteth in vengeance—that he has called into existence millions of rational beings to exist but for a short season in this world of change, and then remove them into a state of endless misery!! Could that Being who gave us life do this, and who, while we were yet sinners gave his Son to die that he might bring us to the Father pure holy and without sin? No! He will never mock poor mortals thus, for he has given us his immutable word that he will not contend forever for the spirit would fail before him and the souls which he has made.

#### INFINITE WISDOM.

Wisdom and knowledge are generally considered as synonymous terms or words of the same import, but such is not the fact. Knowledge consists in having a stock of proper ideas and notion of things. Wisdom consists in reducing these to practice, in conducting the affairs of life with ingenuity and skill. God possesses both infinite knowledge and infinite wisdom. He knows perfectly well what course to pursue in the administration of his government; he puts things into operation in such a manner that and harmony as to have the result according to his design. The Bible informs us that God possesses infinite wisdom and so do the creeds and formularies of men, but the slaves to these creeds, represent him to be an imbecile creature pursuing a course in the management of his dependent creatures which even frail men would be ashamed to initiate.

We have deposited in the hands of the Messengers of the Senate and House this week, a large number of copies of the *Intelligencer* which will be by them laid upon the desk of each member to whom they are directed. Our friends of each branch of the Legislature will receive a copy gratis during the session. If any of them are neglected this week and are anxious to receive the paper, they will please notify us, and we will most cheerfully and promptly furnish them with a copy. This has been the invariable practice of the proprietor of the *Intelligencer* in past years.

Nebuchadnezzar anciently threatened to cast all who would not fall down and worship his God into a fiery furnace, and all limitarian preachers follow his example, by threatening to damn those eternally who will not worship as they may please to have them, the God of heaven and of earth.

This number closes the present volume, and right glad are we for we could not make the paper what we wished to make it when we took charge of it. The next volume will be greatly improved, and we trust our friends will be so well satisfied with its appearance that they will endeavour to second our efforts in the advancement of our cause, by each of the present subscribers procuring a new one and forwarding his name to our office. We cannot promise them any presents in the shape of promises if they conform to our wishes, but we promise to furnish them with as good and as handsome a paper as is issued from any office on the Kennebec River.

Every minister of the gospel should while making known the promises of God, proclaim the threatenings also, and in the language of the wise man assure those who transgress the divine law that though hand join in hand the wicked shall not go unpunished, that God will render to every man according to his deeds whether they be good or evil; and that the punishment pursues the lightning's vivid flash.

If I believed in Universalism said a believer in endless misery, to a friend of

ours the other day, I would revel in vice and iniquity, O then says the Universalist I beg of you not to embrace the doctrine for your neighbors all know you are bad enough already.

Br. Stetson will please accept our thanks for his bundle of 'Short Sermons.' We hope we shall hear from him often in the same acceptable manner.

We regret exceedingly that it has become necessary for us to admit into our columns the reply of Mr. Sheldon to an article in the last *Banner* purporting to be an answer to an address of Mr. Sheldon's to the Universalists of Maine. Had Mr. Drew followed the example of Mr. S. by printing his answer on an extra sheet, it would have saved us the trouble of alluding to this unpleasant subject, but as it is, justice to Mr. Sheldon seems to require that we give publicity to his communication through the columns of the *Intelligencer*. We wish it to be distinctly understood by our readers, that we are not in any way or manner connected with the difficulties which have arisen between Mr. Drew and Mr. Sheldon since the establishment of the *Banner*; neither do we intend to be, any farther than to endeavour to set the parties right whenever they may make any statement which is incorrect in regard to our connexion with the *Intelligencer*. Mr. Drew labors under a mistake when he says "It is proper for me to say here, that more than a year ago he (Mr. Sheldon) proposed to Mr. Fletcher to employ him in my place." This is not true. Mr. Sheldon never made any proposition to me in regard to my assuming the editorial department of the *Intelligencer* till after I had received at Thomaston, the place of my residence, a prospectus for the *Banner*. Once more—there is one sentence in Mr. Drew's reply which savors a little too much of the spirit of the old feudal lords to suit our taste. He says after my informing him that I was to take charge of the *Intelligencer*, "I expressed my surprise that he should have taken this course without consulting with his friends." We are as yet, and have been for these many years capable of transacting business for ourself. We allow no one to dictate us in matters which do not concern them. We have no guardian, we are as free as the air we breathe, and we have yet to learn that we must use for the consent of our friends before we can engage to labor for those who will furnish us with the "staff of life" for ourself and family. We are done, we sincerely hope our columns will not again be filled with such unprofitable communications.

The "appeal to the Universalists of Maine" which the undersigned had the temerity to make, under date of Dec. 30, seems to have disturbed the nerves and awakened the wrath of Mr. Drew, to a lamentable degree. "Truth is mighty and will prevail," is a divine declaration, and to a mind fully impressed with a belief of this declaration, and at the same time desirous of its accomplishment and conscious that its publication could do him no harm, any attack, not based on truth, would naturally be received with equanimity of temper and meted out in a mild and placable spirit. Whether such are the feelings manifested in the article in the last *Banner* headed "Self defence," I leave an impartial public to decide.

I trust I need not again repeat the assurance contained in my appeal, that what I therein felt it my duty to make public, was done so with great regret. The patience and forbearance that I have so long manifested is proof enough to satisfy the public of my sincerity; and Mr. D. himself, if he will but obey the dictates of his own conscience, must admit his belief of its truth. Indeed I have good reason for believing that he would hardly have ventured upon the course he has, but from a belief that I would not resolve upon any step which might render me liable to the assaults of his pen. True it is, that in entering the lists for a conflict with him, I do so at great disadvantage. He, a Goliath, long practised in the arts and stratagems of such warfare, confident in his strength—skilled in the use of his weapons and boasting even of the "tact" with which he wields them,—confident in the strength of his buckler—the exquisite temper of his sword—the breadth of his shield and the ponderosity of his spear, "like unto a weavers beam." Me, but a stripling as it were, destitute of such arms and appliances; with nothing for weapons of offence but a few smooth stones gathered from the running brook; and a sling made of integuments of truth. With no means of defence, but such as nature, unaided by art, or artifice, has supplied. The odds indeed are great; but relying upon the justice of my cause and trusting in "the living God" I venture upon the conflict.

It is an old and common expedient of practised controversialists, to 'manage' so as to make it appear that they act on the defensive, while in reality they are the offending or attacking party. To this expedient has Mr. D. resorted. He entitles his "attack," "self defence," and represents me as having made at least "three public attacks" on him

in the *Trumpet* and with a disposition or intention of extending them to twenty, had not Br. Whittemore refused making that paper their medium. The design of the charge is obviously to make the public believe, that I have been repeatedly making public attacks on him which he with the quietness of a dove and the meekness of a lamb, has endured without resistance. Thus in the outset enlisting the sympathies of readers in his behalf. When I have stated the facts in relation to this matter, the public will be enabled to judge whether Mr. D. himself has not committed as great "mistakes" (to call them by no harder name) as he has attributed to me. Whether indeed, a piece of "self defence," which commences with so great a "mistake," may not be justly suspected of proceeding altogether in mistake.

So far from attacking Mr. D. "three" several times in the *Trumpet*, there never appeared in that paper but one short article in relation to the matters in controversy, written by me, and that was elicited by a letter of Mr. D.'s—with some comment of Br. W.'s published in the *Trumpet*; and was particularly addressed to Br. W. in consequence of his comments. In the *Trumpet* of July 18; Br. W. published a letter from Mr. Drew, announcing, in substance, that he had issued a prospectus for a new paper—that he was induced to do so because the *Intelligencer* was suspended, and not likely to be revived that in consequence of its death, he, Mr. D., was so strenuously urged by the brethren throughout the State to issue a new paper, that he could not decline the measure. Not having the *Trumpet* of July 15th before me, I give the substance of the letter from recollection. This letter, like all of Mr. D.'s writings in relation to the matter, was worded and framed with an especial eye to exciting sympathy in his behalf. To this letter Br. W. prefixed some remarks, from the tenor of which it was manifest to me, that he had imbibed, probably from Mr. D.'s letter and proceedings, very imperfect and erroneous ideas of the facts of the case. Accordingly addressed the letter to him which he published, and the following extract contains all that relates to the matter now at issue; all that precedes the extract was applied to Br. W.'s comments:

"It is a fact I suppose well known to you, that I have long been desirous of disposing of the 'Intelligencer' establishment, and that I partially succeeded in doing so two years ago, but owing to circumstances beyond my control, the arrangements then effected were revoked. Subsequent circumstances probably are not known to you. I will briefly relate some of them. Last November of December I stated to Mr. Drew, that such would be the nature of my business during the then coming year, that I must immediately make some arrangement which would relieve me from any further personal attention to the business concerns of the paper. At his earnest solicitation, accompanied by an intimation that he might soon make arrangements to assume the whole concern to himself, I consented to let things go on as before. Some months ago, I again stated to him that I must immediately dispose of the establishment, even if I sold it in a quarter which would disconnect him from its editorial charge. To this, he made no objection, but on the contrary gave his cordial assent to any arrangements I might make, even, he said, if he were thrown out of employment by it. Somewhat prior to this, Mr. Drew had entered upon a negotiation which if it resulted as he seemed to think it would, would impose upon him the necessity of moving to a distant state. This negotiation was protracted from week to week and from month to month, without apparently coming any nearer to a conclusion. This was the state of the case when the *Intelligencer* arrived at a convenient stopping place, the end of a half vol. I then communicated to him my necessary and unavoidable determination to pause until his negotiation was brought to an issue, or some other arrangement to relieve me was effected. To this he made no objection. I never intimated to him that the paper would be abandoned, nor does it seem to me hardly possible that he could have so inferred from any thing which passed between us. One week after the 'suspension,' I received a written note from Mr. D., inquiring whether I considered him under any obligation to the paper was suspended. To this I replied of course I did not. Three days after this I learnt from a distant Agent of the *Intelligencer*, that a prospectus had been sent him for the 'Banner.' This was the first information, or intimation I had that such a measure was then contemplated.

This letter from which the foregoing is extracted, was written and forwarded to the *Trumpet* office on the 17th of July, (for although the *Trumpet* which contained Mr. D.'s letter was dated July 18—I actually received on the 16)—and though thus seasonably forwarded it was not inserted until August 1, and then was placed on the last page of the paper. The same number of the *Trumpet*, viz: Aug. 1, contained another letter from Mr. D. bearing date July 20, from which I extract as follows:

Br. WHITTEMORE—At the date of my note to you, which you inserted last week, (July 18,) I had not been apprised of the intention of the publisher of the 'Christian Intelligencer' to revive the paper, or of any arrangement which had been made, or were likely to be made to secure its publication. This ignorance on my part will account to you for such part of my communication as proceeded upon the supposition of the improbability of its revival. It seems however, that even before the date of my note to you, he had engaged another editor, Br. Fletcher of East Thomaston, who has discontinued

the *Telescope*, or transferred its subscribers to the *Intelligencer* list, and who will conduct the paper hereafter. Having myself failed to make any arrangement for the revival of the *Intelligencer*, and not being let into the secret of what was going on—it was during the absence of all prospect of its re-appearance that I proposed to publish the 'Gospel Banner,' in order to make sure of a paper. Accordingly the prospectuses were sent out, and the returns which are hourly coming in show that its existence is widely demanded by the brethren.

How many "mistakes" this extract contains, those who have read the statement made in my appeal, bearing in mind the dates of the events, will readily perceive; or rather I should say, how many mistakes the extract was calculated to cause those who read it to make. It is here worthy of remark, that this extract presents a fair sample of Mr. D.'s "tact" in framing a statement so as to keep perhaps mainly within the literal bounds of truth; and yet convey an entirely false impression of the facts. In this "tact" his long self defence abounds. Immediately upon the reception of the *Trumpet* containing the above, I addressed another letter to Br. W. in which I complained of the delay in publishing my first, & of its being put in so obscure a part of the paper; and requesting him to republish it in as conspicuous a place as he had Mr. D.'s, together with a few more remarks upon the new matter Mr. D. had thrown into his second letter. This request was not complied with. Not, as Mr. W. in a personal interview assured me, because of any thing objectionable, but for other satisfactory reasons.

Here then is the foundation of Mr. D.'s charge against me of publishing "three attacks." Two of which were covert attacks on me, by himself; and the third, a mere explanation, by me of facts and circumstances which were not understood by Br. W. and which appeared simultaneously with his second; but yet so obscurely as probably never to have been read by a hundred persons.

Who had the most reason to complain of those attacks I leave an impartial public to judge. I think at any rate, that none will consider his claim to act in "self defence" to be fairly founded on those attacks.

The truth of the case is, these very letters of Mr. D. were among the causes which led to the appeal I felt obliged to make. Though I will frankly admit, that if nothing had since transpired, especially nearer home, of a similar character, I might, and probably should, have remained silent.

But when I found from various quarters that Mr. D. or "his friends," had been industriously and perseveringly spreading reports, that I had thrust him out of employment—that that employment was necessary to his support—that he had commenced the *Banner* because I had given up the *Intelligencer*, and that too without consulting him—that I had abandoned it and the Universalist cause, which must suffer in consequence—and had refused the most liberal offers on his part for purchasing and resuscitating the paper; that he had made strenuous efforts for its revival but could not induce me to issue a new paper; and when in compliance with that call, he had made preparation for publishing the *Banner* I revived the *Intelligencer* for the sole purpose of opposition to him; and other charges of a like nature. I also found statements equally destitute of foundation in circulation, representing that I was not a Universalist and of course not entitled to the sympathy of Universalists. That I was rich, and relying upon my riches, intended to crush Mr. D. who was poor. That I had repeatedly abused and insulted the whole body of Universalists &c. &c. When I learnt these charges, I say, I pondered in my mind, whether I ought not in "self defence" to make an appeal, founded upon facts, to those whose ears had been filled with these lying reports. The resolution was not however adopted without long reflection and delay, and then I solemnly aver I was induced to it mainly by what I considered a duty towards those whose ears had been poisoned; and who were acting under the influence of that poison. I knew indeed, the antidote would not reach all who needed it, but it was nevertheless my duty to offer it.

In that "appeal," it will be noticed, that I confined my expositions to the main charges—those which I deemed were strictly of public importance; while those that were merely personal, I left unnoticed, nor would I advert to them even now, were it not that most of this slander and "gossip," is to say the least, countenanced by much of Mr. D.'s "self defence." I detest with my whole soul, the contemptible practice of alluding in controversy of any and every kind, to mere personal affairs. The riches or poverty, the birth, education, manners &c. &c. of individuals, are personal matters entirely, and should never be brought into public view. He who attempts to excite sympathy in his own behalf by such measures, will merit and receive only the contempt of all well balanced minds.

How effectually I accomplished the object attempted in my appeal, is apparent from the manner and matter of Mr. D.'s "defence." That he has left untouched the

main points of it, must appear evident to all, upon a comparison of the two articles. True, he has made a sweeping denial of each and every one of [my] charges, implications and inferences, length and breadth, yet has not attempted, but in a few feeble instances to refute them. It might be deemed sufficient for me to re-affirm them, and then let them rest, until Mr. D. should more effectually sap their foundation than mere denial can do. And in regard to most of the matters stated in my appeal, supported as they were by facts and circumstances, and "inferences" of irresistible weight, and which he has not even attempted to explain away, nor alluded to at all, except by his general denial, I shall let them rest; re-affirming their truth; and declaring my entire willingness to submit the whole to the decision of any impartial tribunal Mr. D. may choose to select.

Here, indeed, I might leave the whole matter, but as Mr. D. seems to manifest a spirit of defiance, apparently relying upon his (as he conceives,) strongly grounded popularity, I think it advisable, (if it be but to teach him the christian virtue of humility) to proceed in this investigation a little farther.

Mr. D. says I discontinued the *Intelligencer* without consulting him and without his knowledge. How wide this assertion is from the facts, may be learnt from my statements in the "appeal." I am really sorry, that Mr. D. should have allowed his feelings to have obtained the mastery over his prudence so far as to induce him to make the assertion. I think upon reflection he will be sorry he ventured it. He knows I named it to him six months before. He knows also, that I repeated over and over again during six months, that I should be under the necessity of doing so. He must recollect also, upon reflection, that I exhibited the "Extra" announcing the suspension to him before it was printed—that he made no objection to the measure; and that a particular part of it, which related to himself, was modified and altered by his request. If he don't recollect it, the printer can probably refresh his memory. Indeed, he himself furnishes the refutation of the assertions. A little further on he says, that he expostulated with me against sending it out, assigning as he now pretends various reasons against the measure. Now it is apparent that one declaration or the other is false. Indeed they both are. Here I will pause to make a remark upon the peculiar tact with which Mr. D. groups his assertions and pretended facts and conversation. It will be borne in mind, that his leading object all along has been to create and sustain a belief, that I had dismissed him from my service. This impression he endeavours to keep up in his "defence;" and to do it, he takes care so to arrange the chronology of his statements, as that his account of the renewal of the *Intelligencer* and employment of Mr. Fletcher by me precedes the issuing of his prospectus and even the issuing of the first extra announcing its suspension.

Mr. D. dwells considerably upon the offers which he made me for the paper; and the difficulty he had in getting me even to listen to them. He here unwittingly and unintentionally, confirms a statement of mine; though he has not the fairness to attribute the little time I could devote to the business to the right cause. The truth was, and he knew it, that such was the nature of my other engagements I could not devote the time to him which he pretended to consider necessary. He wanted me to go into the printing office, examine the accounts of the subscribers, ascertain how many there were, how much they owed, their goodness, &c.—to go into an estimate of the expenses of the printing; and in fine, into a minute detail of the whole concern. An investigation which would consume days, when he knew I had not minutes, to spare; and when I also knew, that he was about as well acquainted with all these things, as I was. I did nevertheless devote several hours to him, in which I discovered that he was quibbling and consuming time to no purpose. This was two days before the suspension was publicly announced; and of course in season to have prevented it, if he had been very "anxious," to do so. At the close of this interview he made me the magnanimous offer before stated. He wanted to call the number of subscribers 1000 (there were about 1300) and give me 50 cts. a piece for them but would not take the printing office at any rate, nor the debts, though I did not request him to take those of more than a years standing, nor the bad ones. The offer I considered insulting. I did offer him the whole concern, except the debts, for \$1700. I have not room to go into a minute statement, showing the value of the printing office. The materials in it, cost me at least \$2000, and are now worth more than \$1000. Whether I held the concern too high I leave to the judgement of printers, after stating that the office contains two iron presses—a complete standing press—with type, furniture, stands &c. of the best kind, and enough to employ 15 or 20 hands—an office capable of being divided into two, (and there was an individual ready to buy half of it.) There



were about 1300 subscribers and the office was a good run of job work and advertisements, being the only printing office in this place—one of the largest villages in the State. He asserts that at the time of the interview referred to, Mr. S.

"Gave him to understand that my editorial engagements with him had terminated—he no longer needing an Editor; and that in case he ever should revive the paper he should not re-engage me unless I submitted to such new terms as he might propose. It was proper for me to say here that more than a year ago (as I have been credibly informed) he proposed to Mr. Fletcher to employ him in my place—a fact which he kept secret from me, and which I accidentally ascertained from other sources. Moreover, he notified me by letter early in July, before I proposed to publish the Banner, that he no longer considered me in his service."

Now I am sorry to say that in all this Mr. S. has again drawn on his imagination for facts: there is not a word of truth in the whole of it. No such conversation was had with him, and no such declarations were made by me. In regard to the assertion in relation to Mr. F. this gentleman's denial will be found in another column.

All that ever passed between Mr. D. and me in relation to his being continued in employment by me, took place by letter, afterwards, and I have the proof of it in his own hand writing. In his letter of July 21 he writes: "I meant to have asked you yesterday, of course he did not, though he now asserts he did whether, during the suspension of the paper you consider me in your employ or not?" To this I answered in my letter of July 31, that "of course I did not." Here too things are worthy of remark—first, that he did not notify him in writing (in the sense which he means to be understood) that his editorial engagements with me were "terminated;" but that in answer to his inquiry they were suspended, I simply answered, "yes, and second, that he could not, at the time of that letter, have considered the suspension discontinued, for he called it suspended." Here bear in mind, that the day from the date of this, he issued his prospectus, even before the ink was barely dry with which he wrote the acknowledgment that the paper was only "suspended," is not the charge, that he deserted me, as he maintained, even by his own showing? Mr. D. would have the public believe, that again and again made efforts to purchase establishment, and even asserts, that in letter of "July 13 he renewed his offers, &c." The best reply I can make to this is the following extract from that letter: "I do not know what other offer, I can make, than I have made. Those having been declined must of course now be withdrawn." This was a renewal of those offers, was it? A letter of July 13, which Mr. D. parades pompously, as "one of the most friendly" he wrote, "is a curiosity in its way," it pretended a great deal of friendship, but it was the friendliness of an Iago to Othello. I wish I had room to print it upon it.

Mr. D. dwells upon the proposition he made by letter July 21 to leave the matter to three printers as referees, &c., and he then assigned "different" reasons from what I did at the time, for declining the reference, giving the public to understand, that now state things contradictory to what I then, I wish he would publish the whole of my correspondence with him, and the public could then judge for itself. In briefly mentioning upon that letter in my appeal, I signed no other reason for declining the reference, but that "circumstances" had come upon my knowledge accidentally, but opportunity, which induced me to decline, &c.—at those circumstances were I did not

the letter of July 21, proposing a reference, he writes as follows: "I will name the antislavery printer in Hallowell." I cannot think of his name at this moment." How could I decline the reference, if Mr. D. appeared willing to select, as referee on his part, a gentleman whose name even he could not recollect? Probably should not, although there were other reasons for declining the reference, as proposed by him, beside the one I am at mention, and to which I alluded in my appeal.

The letter was brought to me in the evening of July 21 by Br. Adams of Concord, was to preach a lecture here that evening and carried with me. I hastily glanced its contents at the moment, intending to mail it more particularly the next day before the mail closed. Before I had opportunity to do so, I met a gentleman who inquired if "I had seen Mr. Rice, the antislavery printer?" I replied I had not, and why he put the question. He replied Mr. Rice had some notion of purchasing the Intelligencer, and would probably call on me to know my terms.

Now this Mr. Rice was the gentleman whom Mr. D. had designated as a referee, whose name, according to the letter, he did not call to mind; implying of course his slight knowledge of him. Upon a man's reflection, it occurred to me that I frequently heard Mr. D. speak of Mr. Rice, and so pointedly withal, that I could conceive it at all probable that his name had been forgotten by Mr. D. Was it not therefore that I should have at once declined a reference under such suspicious circumstances, especially as Mr. D. required an answer to his propositions, as directly preclude all opportunity for inquiry? In justice to Mr. R. I feel to express my present belief, that under such circumstances he would have declined as a referee; but at the moment this view of the subject did not occur

little else in Mr. D.'s animadversions of comment. It must, I think, be the fact that all who have read my appeal, has totally failed of controverting the material statements contained therein. This I well knew he could not do, and carefully weighed those statements as cautious not to advance any position that was not perfectly tenable. It is further seen, that so 'reluctant' as I was in this matter in its most disagreeable features that I purposely suppressed the most reprehensible proceedings of Mr. D. and I can assure him that my foreboding is not yet entirely exhausted, as he if he chooses longer to continue the controversy in the manner and spirit of self defence." There are, however,

one or two things more upon which I must claim the indulgence of my readers, for saying a few words, before I bring this, already too long, article to a close.

Mr. D. now pretends that he issued his prospectus with a view to obtain subscribers to be added to the Intelligencer list; and that in conformity with this view, he actually offered to transfer them to me. There is much, I fear, of insincerity and deception in this assertion. It is true, that in his very "friendly letter" of July 13, there were some intimations from him that such had been his purpose. But what credit could I possibly give to the sincerity of such a purpose, in view of all the circumstances of the case.—He had issued a prospectus and sent it out to all my agents, simultaneously with the notice of the suspension of the Intelligencer, and had so managed the whole matter as that the subscription to the Banner was calculated to be, and actually was, drawn principally from the Intelligencer. This proceeding too, was wholly without my privity or knowledge, and was not made known to me for many days, and then it was not communicated by him. And further, before that "friendly letter" came to hand, I had learnt that he had contracted for a printing office and completed other arrangements for going on with the Banner. How then could I consider such intimations but mere mockery? It is plain, indeed, that that letter was written entirely with reference to ulterior events, viz. for the purpose of being referred to, precisely in the way it has been, provided the emergency should arise, which would render such a reference useful to him—which emergency he had the forecast to perceive would likely ensue. It was in fact, what the sailors term carrying an anchor to windward.

Mr. D. boasts of the faithfulness with which he performed his editorial duties &c. As I had not charged him with unfaithfulness in this particular, it would seem altogether out of place for him to refer to this subject, while professing to act in "self defence." But as he has voluntarily chosen to refer to his services in that capacity—and especially to what he calls extra services—I may be permitted to say a word in reply. It is true that during the first years of his editorial career, I had little cause to complain of him, but truth compels me to declare, that during the last two or three years he did not perform his duty with that diligence and attention which I had a right to expect and demand; and in proof of this assertion, I appeal to the several printers who have had the means of knowing the fact.—In regard to the "extra service," by night and by day, as I am not conscious of his having performed any which was not fully offset by "extra" favors from me, I feel under no obligation to him on that score.

That I have been sincerely reluctant to spread these things before the public, Mr. D. as I have before remarked—has abundant reasons for knowing to be true. What I have written has been written strictly in "self defence." Desirous too of not allowing this "personal" matter, as Mr. D. calls—but strictly public matters, as I deem them—to occupy the columns of the Intelligencer, incurred the expense, of issuing my appeal upon an extra sheet and regret that he has not seen fit to follow the example. If he should deem it advisable further to prosecute his attacks upon me—publicly—(his private attacks I have as yet said nothing about.) I hope he will resort to the same mode, and I will meet him in the same way.

But I have a proposition to make, which if accepted will entirely remove all pretext for continuing this controversy in print. I am willing to submit the whole matter to the decision of our religious friends in the Legislature, or such a Committee as they will select, giving us both a fair and full opportunity for telling our respective stories.

One word more and I have done. Mr. D. represents that I have said, that having money enough to run him down, I would do so. This representation I pronounce false in every particular.

P. SHELDON.

## THE QUESTION SETTLED.

It seems somebody whose name begins with C, had seen or heard of my "appeal" and having occasion to come to 'Kennebec' (by which is meant Augusta) he embraced the opportunity to ascertain the correctness of its statements. Whereupon, to his great apparent satisfaction, he obtained explanations from a source deemed by him perfectly 'authentic' (viz. W. A. Drew) which completely settled the question in Mr. D.'s favor. Elated with this impartial decision, he forthwith 'communicates' it to the public through the columns of the Banner!!!

Again, Mr. D. says he has 130 subscribers to the "Banner" in Augusta. This he conceives is conclusive evidence, that his proceedings have been perfectly fair and honorable! Query? How many of those subscribers know any thing of the facts in the case?

P. S.

## RETRIBUTION.

It is a fixed and darling principle with the popular religionists of the day, that this world is a state of probation, and not of retribution. They contend that rewards and punishments are not meted out here according to the merit or demerit of men's actions. God does not here fully reward the virtuous or punish the vicious. This sentiment is not only opposed to that Scripture which declares that the "righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner;" but it appears to us directly calculated to shake man's confidence in the justice of the Great moral Governor of the world.

The poet asks what can we reason but from what we know? And the answer is that though we may rear an hypothesis and reason from it, yet the lessons of experience, and principles drawn from her teachings alone are to be relied upon. Let us suppose then, for a moment, that all past experience has placed God in the character of a delinquent in point of justice. Six thousand years has the earth rolled upon her axis, and all that time, in every nation, and with each individual of every nation, he has been a debtor. He has neither rewarded the virtuous nor punished the vicious as much as

they deserve. What possible hope can there be that he will ever do it? True we may be told that he has promised to make it all right in the future world. But what confidence can be placed in the justice of a being, whom the experience of six thousand years has failed to present in the full exercise of justice? If God has not been just for six thousand years past, then from all this experience the presumption most unquestionably is that he will not be just for six thousand years to come? And if we add to this the fact that he is immutable, both in his nature and the principles of his government, there can be little confidence in his justice. Reader reflect upon this subject at leisure.

I. D. W.

## "THE JUDGEMENT SEAT."

An opinion still exists among many professing Christians, that there will be a day of judgment in the future state, at which time all will appear before the judgment seat of Christ. It is also thought that every individual will there be tried and sentenced to happiness or misery, according as his deeds have been righteous or unrighteous on the earth. Although many Christians of the present day believe this doctrine, yet it is not peculiar to Christians. Both Jews and Mahometans have a common faith in this article.—And we are persuaded that those Christians who hold this notion are indebted to Jews and Mahometans instead of the New Testament for this doctrine. Although it is said that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ," yet it is not said that this seat is in the future world. Christ has said that he came into this world for judgment. Then if all are to appear before his seat to receive according to their deeds, that appearance must be in this world where Christ sits as Judge. There is no mention in Scripture of our going to judgment. But wherever the subject of judgment is mentioned, it is represented as coming to us.—The judgment seat, then, before which we must all appear, may be considered the unchanging decisions of Christianity, by which evil is adequately punished and virtue rewarded. The peculiar expression used by the Apostle, "Judgment seat," was doubtless borrowed from the Jews, or rather, suggested from the "Judgment seat," under the old dispensation. As the Jews supposed that the decision of Jehovah were obtained by coming before their Judgment seat, so Paul very naturally introduces that expression, that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ," or abide by the decisions of his doctrine. As Christianity extends in the world, and mankind are made acquainted with its requirements, they are coming before his seat of Judgment. Let the gospel spread till all shall appear before his seat.

Watch &amp; Impartialist.

## THE ORGAN.

Of all the instruments, this is the most noble, possessing powers of the greatest extent and variety. How the sober dignity of its tones harmonizes with the dark, massive pile which we walk around and view with wonder! While gazing on the heavy towers on high, its hollow tones within speak of mass and vespers. And as we pace the long dark aisles of light and shade, where the glowing beams of tinted windows fall on the youthful fair, kneeling to ask heaven's grace so beautifully expressed by the poet—

Rose bloom fell on her hands together prest,  
And on her silver cross soft amethyst,  
And on her hair a glory like a saint.

How the heavenly tones in solemn grandeur roll along! It is only upon the continent that we can enjoy these sublime sensations. Holland, the Low Countries, and Germany are spread over with these majestic instruments in profuse variety. At Harlem there is one of stupendous size; the effect of which surpasses every thing the mind can conceive. They are sounds which seem to roll from the skies into the abyss of harmony. In the service of the Dutch, psalmody is generally performed. For the purpose of leading their immense congregations, of not less than three thousand voices singing in unison, these organs are furnished with an enormous pipe, called the vox humana, which so predominate over the rolling thunder of the double diapasons, that you might conceive it to be the voice of a monster, concealed in this mountain of sounds. The grandeur of this organ is much augmented by the vastness of the church in which it stands. Higher than Westminster Abbey, it fills up the end of the large aisle, reaching from the ground to the roof, and from one side to the other, the pipes have the appearance of vast columns of silver. The extemporary flourishes which the organists introduce between the lines of the psalm, can only be compared to a commotion of the elements, or the rolling of the surges upon the shore. The largest organs in England are but mere toys compared to this magnificent instrument, which strikes the senses with awe and wonder.

## TEMPER.

A bad temper in a woman, poisons all her happiness, and turns her milk to gall; blights her youth, brings on premature, fretful old age—pals all her enjoyments, banishes all her friends and renders her home comfortless and barren.

Far different is the ripe, rich harvest of a home, made bright and happy by the sweet temper and mild deportment of an amiable wife, who if affliction cross her husband abroad, finds comfort and consolation in his home, is happy in a companion whose temper is like the silver surface of a lake, calm, serene and unruffled. If he is rich, his admiring friends rejoice in his prosperity and delight in his hospitality, because all around is light, airy, and sunshine; if he is poor, he breaks his crust in peace and thankfulness, for it is not steeped in the water of bitterness. An amiable temper is a jewel of inestimable value in the sum of earthly happiness, because with that alone, the whims of a cross husband may be subdued; many vices may be overcome; the boisterous may be tamed, the unruly conquered; the

fretful tranquilized—and the hurricane softened and hushed, as the mild zephyr that swept o'er the honey-suckle under the casement.

## NEWS DEPARTMENT.

—And catch the manners living as they rise."

GARDINER, JANUARY 15, 1836.

## LATEST FROM FRANCE.

ARRIVAL OF MR. BARTON. The packet ship Albany, Capt. Johnson, arrived at N. York on Wednesday last from Havre, whence she sailed on the 3d Dec. Mr. Barton, the American Charge d'Affaires at Paris, has returned in her. The dates by this arrival are from Paris to the 1st and Havre to the 2d December.

The New York Courier and Enquirer states that the character of the news will be considered conclusive so far as it relates to our affairs with France, and there can be no longer any doubt that France has determined not to do us justice without a degrading apology from our Executive.

The Journal of Commerce, on the contrary says:—The apprehension of war was greater than at any previous time, but it was founded partly if not chiefly upon an erroneous estimate of the feeling on this side the water, and particularly in the mind of Gen. Jackson. The message will probably lead to a speedy adjustment of the controversy.

Under date of Toulon, Nov. 25, it is stated that a telegraph express had brought orders to the Maritime Perfect to complete immediately on the war establishment, the ships of the line Algeiras of 84 guns, Scipion 82, and the frigate Artemise of 52; that these ships are destined to make part of the squadron of observation.

The Moniteur of Dec. 1st, contains an ordinance, nominating Vice Admiral Baron Mackau, Governor of Martinique, who is to take command of the squadron of observation which is to rendezvous in the W. Indies.

From the Havre Journal, of Dec. 1.

The ministry is desirous of appearing before the Chambers, ready to face all the consequences of the amendment of Valze, on the American question.—The papers of the different provinces announce that preparations for defence are going on in our seaports. Armaments are in vigorous progress of equipment at Brest and Toulon, levies of sailors are in the course of organization or all the coast of France. Beside the fleet placed under the command of Admiral Mackau, fifteen ships of the line, as many frigates and a large number of smaller vessels will be so disposed as to be ready for sea at the shortest notice.

A sad calamity occurred at Greenock, Nov. 21st, in consequence of the bursting of the dam on Carrishburn rivulet. The torrent in its progress towards the sea, overflowed almost the entire suburbs of Greenock, called Crayford's Dyke, destroying property to the value of £20,000, and 48 lives.

The Theatre at Christiania, (Norway,) was destroyed by fire on the 6th Nov.—the spectators and actors having barely time to escape.

Earthquake in Italy. The Neapolitan Gazette of the 17th November, contains an account of the destruction of Castiglioni by an earthquake, and the burying of more than 100 of its inhabitants under the ruins.

From the Journal du Commerce.

Insurance against War. What we yesterday announced as probable, has already happened. Letters received from London of the 24th instant, announce a rise upon the premium on insurance against war, which makes the premium on our ships going from French ports to the United States, exactly the same rate as is charged by the Insurance Offices in this capital.

From the Journal du Havre.

As, thanks to the skill and energy of our skillful negotiators, the question of a war between France and the United States is more talked of than ever, a considerable number of applications are said to have been made to the Ministers of Marine for letters of Marque by merchants in the ports most favorably situated for arming privateers, and taking advantages of the first breaking out of hostilities.

LOXDOX, Nov. 23. The prospect of a quarrel between France and America, appears to be viewed in a more serious light than at first, in proportion as it comes to be understood how firmly each government is determined not to take the first step towards conciliation. Many persons here have the impression that the French Government is not secretly at all indisposed to a collision with the United States, as a measure not disagreeable to the people, and tending to divert their attention from its own acts.

From the National Intelligencer.

THE WAR IN FLORIDA.—We are sorry to learn that the hostilities between the Indians and the whites in East Florida embrace a wider field than we had supposed. The Charleston Courier of the 30 ult. calls upon the citizens of that place to furnish troops, arms, and ammunition immediately for the relief of the Floridians, against the incursions of the Indians, who are said to be burning, murdering, and destroying every thing that comes in their way. Volunteers will undoubtedly march from Charleston for this purpose. At Savannah a public meeting was held on the 28th., at which it was determined that volunteers should set out for Picolata on the very next day. General Clinch has, it appears, about 500 United States soldiers under his command. The force of the Indians is computed to be 1500 warriors, besides a body of about 600 persons, composed of desperadoes and runaways. Governor Eaton and family arrived at Mobile 17th ultimo, from New Orleans, on his way to Florida.

[From the same.]

We learn that information has been received by private letters, in this city, of the ports of Mexico having been shut

against the vessels of the United States. a measure induced probably by the embargement of so many of our citizens in hostilities against the authorities of that country. We have no farther information, however, than the naked fact of the shutting of the ports. This measure will be very seriously felt in New Orleans, the exports to Mexico from that city, for which specie has been usually received in return, amounting to six or eight millions of dollars annually. There are rumors also, from New Orleans, of one or two very heavy mercantile failures in that city.

## THE UNITED STATES &amp; PRUSSIA.

The *Swabian Mercury* of the 8th inst. has the following of the 1st from Berlin:—Instructions have been sent to the Prussian Minister to the United States, directing him to announce the intention of our Monarch to regulate our commercial intercourse with the United States by an advantageous treaty, which communication has been favorably received by President Jackson. Since the arrival of Mr. Wheaton, as American Charge d'Affaires at Berlin, negotiations have opened, but the question is not yet to regulate the commercial relations of the United States with Prussia alone, but with the whole Germanic Confederation. Several other American Consuls are likewise expected in different parts of Germany. The United States will probably urge that rice and tobacco pay too high duties. In order to stimulate commerce and navigation in the Prussian ports of the Baltic, and in order to attract American shipping to Stettin, Danzig, and Memel, the Prussian Government has reduced the duties on American articles 25 per cent. upon tariff. This great loss to the Germanic Union of Customs will be made up from the Royal Treasury of Prussia. This favor has not yet been signalized by great advantages. The Americans, who freight ships for Bremen and Hamburg, perform these voyages three or four times a year, whereas they go to the Baltic but twice. Those who go to Bremen and Hamburg, have the advantage of not paying the duties of the Sound.

We understand that the crew of the schr. Alfred, to which the man belonged that was found on the beach near the fort, on the morning of the 22d of October last, have been arrested on suspicion of murder and are to have their trial at Newburyport in a few days. Several gentlemen of this town have been summoned as witnesses in the case.

[Glow. Dem.]

Revenue of New York. The amount of revenue collected at the Custom House in New York during the quarter ending on the 30th September last amounted to no less a sum than \$5472,642 04, which is more than half the revenue of the year 1834.

The Committee of Ways and Means have reported a bill appropriating the sum of one million eight hundred seventy-five thousand four hundred and twenty-one dollars for the construction, repair, or completion of fortifications on the seaboard of the United States.

## MARRIED.

In this town, on Sunday evening last, MAJ. ISAAC N. TUCKER to MISS SARAH C. STEWART, both of this town.

In Monmouth, Col. James R. Bachelier of Readfield, to Mrs. Ann White.

## DIED.

In this town at the residence of her Father, on Sunday the 10th inst. Mrs. DELIA TIGHE JONES, daughter of Robert H. Gardiner, aged 23.

Truly and beautifully has it been said,

"There is a tear for all that die,  
A mourner o'er the humblest grave"

Yet when death seizes for his victim the stricken in years "or the bruised in spirit," consolation is forced upon us in the thought, that in the bowed down age, he has but his lawful prey; and the heart feels a melancholy resignation in the reflection, that the wretched, to whom existence is a burden, are released from their sufferings. But when the young, the happy, the lovely and the good, are prematurely called to pay the last "sad debt of nature" when we see one to whom want and sorrow were strangers—one for whom earth had no shadow, and life no tear, laid low on the cold altar of death, it is not in human nature to suppress the deep anguish of our souls at the sight. "It is vain to say to the 'troubled waters' of the heart, 'peace be still.' And such a lovely and unaccounted victim was Mrs. J. Before Consumption began its destroying work, her days seemed to flow in an unbroken stream of peace and happiness. She had indeed drank deep at the fountain of life's brightest joys. The nearest, dearest, and holiest ties of life were hers. Happy in the immeasurable and tried affection of those to whom she was bound by nature's ties—blessed with the deep love of one to whom she was a world of happiness—she was rich in the affections of the heart—and with worldly wealth to surround her the charms and luxuries of life, to the generous impulses of her nature; a heart to mind of pure and gentle imaginings, ought writing to complete her measure of earthly bliss.

"Death loves a shining mark," and laid his cunning hand on her. Earth has claimed for its own that lovely form whose beauty but reflected the bright spirit within,—but that "spirit has gone to God who gave it."

We were not human did we not mourn that thou art gone from us bright spirit. But for ourselves should we weep—for we know that the joys of earth are fleeting, and that there is a cup of sorrow for all who linger long in this world of shadows, and we should rejoice rather than mourn that thine early death has saved thee from quaffing its bitterness. Far better for the flower to be plucked in its bloom, than left to be chilled by autumn winds, or blasted by winter frosts,—and happiness cannot be an enduring plant on earth. We will believe that thine begun on earth shall be perfected in heaven.

We mourn, but not thy loss deplored one;  
We pity—but the living, not the dead."

Ccm.

## SHRIFF SALE.

KENNEBEC, 25—

TAKEN ON Execution and will be sold at Public Vendue, on MONDAY, the eighth day of February, next at two o'clock in the afternoon at the Tavern of Charles Sager in Gardiner in said County, all the right in Equity which Joshua Robinson has to redeem a certain tract of land situated in said Gardiner, and bounded as follows (to wit.) Westerly by the road leading from Gardiner to Brunswick, southerly by lot No. 2, Easterly by the rear line of South fronting on said Brunswick road—Northerly by lot No. 3, A. as by the Plan of Colchester. Contes tract made in the Year A. D. 1803 and 4 by Solomon Adams Esq. it being the same lot whereon the said Joshua Robinson now lives containing about fifty Acres more or less.

E. MARSHALL, Dep't. Sh'.

Gardiner January 15, 1836